

thing of the kind, and that nothing was further removed from his mind than to impose such a servitude upon his State. The pope, of course, was dissatisfied; but his dissatisfaction availed not—England remained free. His holiness felt that there was but little to be gained by a struggle with an enemy so determined and so far removed, so he wisely decided to leave him alone.

Boleslas II., King of Poland, surnamed the Brave, was not so fortunate as William. There are few characters in history more attractive than that of the unfortunate Polish monarch whose end was so untimely, and whose death is wrapped up in so much mystery. He was known as one of the bravest leaders and most successful generals in Europe, while his boundless hospitality and kind-hearted readiness to serve made his court the refuge of all the unfortunate princes on the continent. He restored to their thrones no less than three of these fugitive kings, and yet died himself a miserable fugitive and outlaw, a victim of the tyranny of the Romish See, whom no one either would or could help. The complaint against him was the same as that afterwards brought against our Henry II. The Church had already begun the struggle against the civil power which has ever since been waged with untiring ardor in every country in which the hierarchy could manage to obtain a strong footing, and the last and most insolent of whose pretensions is to be found in the Syllabus of Pius IX. Boleslas, it may readily be conceived, was too powerful a King, and too absolute a monarch, tamely to submit to dictation from any of his own subjects, whether lay or ecclesiastical. The struggle, therefore, between the Church and the Crown was long and bitter. At the head of the former party was the Bishop of Cracow, the Thomas á Becket of Poland. His fate was much the same as that of his future English imitator, and doubtless he de-

served it quite as richly—he was slain at the altar, while officiating. Gregory VII. immediately excommunicated the king, and relieved his subjects from their allegiance,—and, a stretch of power which never was attempted before and has not since been ventured upon, declared, in punishment for the offence, the Crown of Poland permanently forfeited, and the country no longer a kingdom. The king, whose popularity had for some time been on the wane, was obliged to seek safety in flight, and is said to have finished his days serving in a menial capacity in a monastery in Carinthia. His brother Ladislaus was, by the kind permission of Gregory, elected to the throne in 1082 as Duke of Poland, and without the title of king.

Nicephorus Bryennius, who rebelled against Michael VII., also came under the censure of Rome and was duly excommunicated. In this case the interference of the pope could certainly not have much weight; but it was a systematic carrying out of the plan laid down for himself by Gregory VII., of making Rome the sole arbiter of the differences of all Christian monarchs, and the pope the king and supreme master of all princes.

About the same time that our William was summoned to come and do homage, another Norman, Robert Guiscard, also received notice to do homage for the kingdom of Naples and Sicily, which he had founded, and more particularly for the duchies of Apulia and Calabria. The request met with the same fate as that made to the English king. As a matter of course, excommunication followed, for which neither Robert nor his followers cared one jot. It was not to be supposed that a set of lawless adventurers, whose whole lives were passed in breaking every law of man and God, would be intimidated by the empty thunders of the Vatican,—it took something more tangible to frighten them. The excommunication, unno-